



AF 3722

R/K
8/22/01

#13

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS
BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL IN AN
ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO: COMMISSIONER OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS, WASHINGTON, D.C.
20231, ON THE DATE INDICATED BELOW.

PATRICIA BRUNELLE
NAME OF PERSON SIGNING

Patricia Brunelle 8/16/01
SIGNATURE DATE

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Application of)
)
Strobel et al.) Examiner: H. Tsai
)
Title: METHOD FOR MAKING DIE BOARDS,) Group Art Unit: 3722
AND MATERIALS AND APPARATUS)
FOR PRACTICING THE METHOD)
)
Serial No.: 09/558,575) (Our Docket No. P48-1229-1)
)
Filed: April 26, 2000)

Hartford, Connecticut, August 16, 2001

Box: AF
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

REPLY BRIEF

S I R:

Applicants submit this Reply Brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §
1.193(b)(1) in the appeal of the above-identified patent application.

The Examiner states in his Answer that the Appeal Brief does not
contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences, and
therefore it is presumed that there are none. Examiner further states that the
Board may exercise its discretion to require an explicit statement as to the
existence of any related appeals and interferences. From the foregoing, the
Examiner makes it appear as if Applicants did not bother to answer the question
on this matter. On the contrary, Applicants explicitly state in the Appeal Brief

RECEIVED
AUG 22 2001
TC 3700 MAIL ROOM

that there are no related appeals or interferences of which Applicants are aware regarding the above-referenced application.

Examiner in his Answer maintains that Arnold (U.S. Pat. No. 4,662,803) discloses all of the limitations described in claim 30, and that "Arnold clearly anticipates the claimed invention." Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner's conclusion for the reasons stated in the Appeal Brief and further in view of the following remarks.

Independent claim 30 of the present invention recites a first cutting portion defining a first outer diameter and a second cutting portion defining a second outer diameter extending from and coaxial with said first cutting portion. Moreover, claim 30 states that each of said first and second cutting portions are defined in part by at least two helical cutting flutes extending longitudinally. From the claim language it can be concluded that each of the first and second cutting portions includes a cutting flute and is associated with a respective first and second outer diameter that is readily ascertainable (i.e., the first and second outer diameters are generally constant throughout the cutting portions). The general constancy of the first and second outer diameters enables these diameters to be used as reference values. Claim 31, for example, which incorporates by reference the limitations of claim 30, recites that the first cutting portion further includes a tapered (i.e., transition section) having a diameter that progressively decreases from the first outer diameter (first reference value) to the second outer diameter (second reference value).

Arnold (U.S. Pat. No. 4,662,803) shows one cutting portion defining flutes 23, 24, 25 and 26, and another cutting portion comprising the countersink cutter 44. As shown in FIG. 1, this cutting portion comprising the countersink cutter 44 is not of a diameter that is readily ascertainable or constant. On the contrary, the diameter of the cutting portion 44 in its entirety is tapered or progressively increases in diameter along a longitudinal direction away from the other cutting portion defining the flutes 23-26. Nor can the cutting portion defining the countersink cutter 44 be considered as including the constant-diameter portion of the cylindrical body 42. The constant-diameter portion of the cylindrical body 42 does not have any cutting surfaces extending outwardly therefrom for performing a cutting operation. (As recited in claim 30 of the

present invention, each of the cutting portions is defined in part by at least two helical cutting flutes extending longitudinally). The only cutting operation performed at this end of the reamer is the cutting portion comprising the countersink cutter 44 which along its entire longitudinal length is of a progressively changing diameter.

Accordingly, it cannot be maintained that Arnold discloses a first cutting portion defining a first outer diameter and a second cutting portion defining a second outer diameter, and wherein each of the first and second cutting portions are defined in part by at least two helical cutting flutes extending longitudinally, as recited in independent claim 30 of the present invention. Accordingly, claim 30 is not anticipated by Arnold. Because claims 31 and 32 depend from and thereby incorporate by reference the limitations of claim 30, these dependent claims are likewise deemed not anticipated by Arnold for at least the reasons set forth for the independent claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing arguments advanced in Applicants' Appeal Brief and Reply Brief, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 30-32 is not well-founded. Applicants respectfully request this Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection and to allow the application under appeal to issue as a patent.

No fees or deficiencies in fees are believed to be required. However, authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 13-0235 in the event any such fees are required.

Respectfully submitted, /

By Daniel G. Mackas
Daniel G. Mackas
Registration No. 38,541
Attorney for Appellant

McCormick, Paulding & Huber LLP
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402
(860) 549-5290